

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-2 and 10-11 are pending. Claims 3-9 have been canceled. Claims 1-2 and 10 have been amended. Claim 11 has been added. Support for amended and added claims can be found in the specification. No new matter has been added. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the claims in light of the amendments and following remarks.

Applicants submit that the cited references do not teach or suggest, individually or in combination, each and every feature of the present invention as claimed. For example, claim 1 recites, in part, “the rotary shaft is hollow-cylindrical with open ends, an inner wall of the rotary shaft is coated with a light-reflecting layer.” Nowhere do the cited references discuss these features as claimed. U.S. patent 4,475,035 to Eaton et al. (“Eaton”) clearly does not discuss an inner wall of its hollow vertical shaft 22 as being coated with a light-reflecting layer in the manner claimed. Examiner acknowledges this fact in the Office Action, page 4. Similarly, U.S. patent 6,379,015 to Wilhelm et al. (“Wilhelm”) does not discuss an inner wall of its pointer shaft 3, which examiner presumably analogizes to a rotary shaft, as being coated with a light-reflecting layer in the manner claimed.

Examiner relies on U.S. patent 6,338,561 to Ikarashi (“Ikarashi”) to cure the deficiencies of Eaton to show that “a light reflecting layer (126) is used for the purpose of increasing illuminating light reflecting efficiency.” (Office Action: p. 5). However, light-reflecting layer 126 is formed on a restricting plate portion 121 of the shielding element 12 in an area corresponding to a specified area of the indicating portion which is located within the central region of swing motion of the luminous point. It does not disclose or suggest forming a light-reflecting layer on the inner wall of shielding element 12. This is because the shielding element 12 is provided for the purpose of “suppress internal reflections within the central region of swing motion R as much as possible so that the uniformity of illumination would not be impaired.” (Ikarashi: col. 5, lines 31-33). Coating the inner wall of the shielding element 12 with a light-reflecting layer is clearly contradictory to this purpose.

Furthermore, applicants submit that there is no motivation to combine Eaton with Ikarashi. In fact, Eaton teaches away from the combination. An obviousness analysis under 35

U.S.C. 103 requires that the references must be considered as a whole and must suggest the desirability of making the combination. MPEP 2141. Examiner asserts that a person having ordinary skill in the art would “modify Eaton by coating the shaft with a light-reflecting layer as taught by Ikarashi for the purpose of increasing illuminating light reflecting efficiency.” (Office action: p. 5). However, in Eaton, the very small cross-sectional area light beam 28 from laser 26 is reflected downwardly through the “center of the shaft 22,” and the retro-directed light collected by lens 56 is collimated. (Eaton: col. 2, line 60 - col. 3, line 2; col. 3, lines 43-48). Thus, coating inner wall of shaft 22 would not increase illuminating light reflecting efficiency for purposes Eaton as suggested by examiner.

For at least the above reasons, claim 1 should be allowed. Claim 2, which depends from claim 1, should be allowed for at least a similar rationale as discussed for claim 1, as well as the additional features it recites.

Claim 10 recites, in part, “the rotary shaft is hollow-cylindrical with open ends, an inner wall of the rotary shaft is coated with a light-reflecting layer.” The cited references do not at least teach or suggest, individually or in combination, these features of claim 10. Claim 10 should be allowed for at least this reason.

Claim 11 recites, in part, “the rotary shaft is hollow-cylindrical with both ends open.” The cited references do not at least teach or suggest, individually or in combination, these features of claim 11. Claim 11 should be allowed for at least this reason.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at (650) 326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,



Tyrome Y. Brown  
Reg. No.: 46,580

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 650-326-2400  
Fax: 415-576-0300  
RTO/vap  
60417194 v2